



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*MUSIC ON THE SHAKESPEARIAN STAGE.* By G. H. Cowling. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1913. 8vo, pp. viii, 116.

The reader, I think, will be able to discern the character of this volume from the following prefatory remarks of the author:

When my friend Professor Vaughan asked me if I had thought over any subject for a dissertation, I felt depressed. For I remembered the melancholy compilation that is expected from a student who sets out to take a degree in English Literature.

The following essay is the outcome of curiosity—curiosity to know with what sort of stage-music and musical effect the Elizabethan dramatists produced their plays. . . . It may be objected that all this is purely antiquarian in its aim; but even if it were, it must not be assumed that all antiquarian research is of the dry-as-dust sort.

As one might suspect from the tone of these utterances, the author lacks that thorough knowledge of the subject, and fails in that painstaking care of details, which would give to his work a very high value. His book, one must frankly say, is full of annoying inaccuracies, of naïve statements, and of generalizations based upon insufficient research. Yet one must hasten to add that it deals with an interesting subject of some importance to a correct understanding of early theatrical performances, and that in spite of obvious deficiencies in scholarship it will prove valuable to students of the Tudor-Stuart drama.

The first chapter is entitled "Music in Pre-Shakespearian Drama." Here the author quickly betrays his lack of a wide familiarity with the religious drama. For example, in dealing with the mystery plays he fails to take into consideration the guild accounts, which are full of significant references to music and musicians. As Mr. E. K. Chambers (*The Mediaeval Stage*, ii, 140) remarks: "The professional assistance of the minstrels . . . was a usual and a considerable item in the expenses." And the importance of these recorded expenses Mr. Chambers illustrates as follows: "At the Chelmsford performance just mentioned the waits of Bristol and no less than forty other minstrels were employed. There is no sign of a musical accompaniment to the dialogue of the existing plays, which were spoken, and not, like that of their liturgical forerunners, chanted." But we hear nothing of these guild records in the chapter under discussion; Mr. Cowles, it would seem, contented himself with examining the text of "the first play, *The Creation*, in existing series of plays." And even this examination, one is led to fear, was not thorough. Of the Towneley Cycle he says: "The Towneley play of *The Creation*, etc., has twelve leaves missing, so that it is impossible to say whether musicians were employed. This series has but few stage-directions, yet it would be rash to draw thence the conclusion that the Towneley plays were played without music. For example the second *Shepherds'*

*Play* ends with the Yorkshire shepherds bringing toys for the holy child to Bethlehem. Their last words are:

*First Shepherd.* What grace we have fun.

*Second Shepherd.* Come forth, now are we won.

*Third Shepherd.* To sing are we bun.  
Let take on loft.

—And it is likely that they finished their show with a carol.” Now a careful examination of the play shows that after line 189 the three shepherds unite in a song; that after line 476 Mak sings “clere out of toyne”; that after line 638 “Angelus cantat”; and that after line 664 the three shepherds apparently sing again. Thus instead of one there were in the play probably five songs. The suspicion that the author’s examination of the play was superficial is strengthened by his later statement: “To Heywood also belongs the credit of leading up to song with fitting dialogue” (subsequently he refers to this as “Heywood’s manner”), and he cites *The Four Ps* by way of evidence. But the first song in the second *Shepherds’ Play* is more effectively and even more elaborately introduced than the song in *The Four Ps*:

I. *Pastor.* By the roode,  
Thyse nyghtys ar long!  
Yit I wold, or we yode,  
Oone gaf vs a song.

II. *Pastor.* So I thocht as I stode,  
To myrth vs emong.

III. *Pastor.* I grauntt.

I. *Pastor.* Lett me syng the tenory.

II. *Pastor.* And I the tryble so hye.

III. *Pastor.* Then the meyne fallys to me.  
Lett se how ye chauntt.

The song is here introduced with conscious art; and I imagine that it would not be difficult to find similar cases in other plays much earlier than those of Heywood. The discussion of the moralities is wholly inadequate. Was the author unaware of *Mankind* and *The Castell of Perseverance*, and the songs and instrumental music in these plays? More serious still, Mr. Cowles ignores the influence of the Chapel Royal and of the various singing children on the development of song and instrumental music in the drama.

The second chapter deals with “An Elizabethan Stage and Its Music.” Again one finds the same sort of defects. How can the author declare: “It was Marlowe who popularized trumpets in battle scenes”? We do not know enough about the plays that preceded Marlowe’s to make such a generalization. Probably, after all, the military authorities determined the use of trumpets, drums, and ensigns by armies. A second example of generalization on insufficient evidence must suffice for the purposes of this review. *The Malcontent*, which was written by Marston for the Blackfriars playhouse, was stolen in 1604 by the actors at the Globe, in retaliation, it would seem, for the theft, by the children, of *The Spanish Tragedy*. Webster wrote a long Induction by way of explana-

tion, in the course of which the actor Sly asks Burbage: "What are your additions?" and Burbage answers: "Sooth, not greatly needful; only as your salad to your great feast, and to abridge the not-received custom of music in our theatre." Mr. Cowles quotes this passage, and draws the sweeping conclusion: "Here is proof that music was not in regular use at the *Globe* in 1604, though there must have been trumpets and drums to play the flourishes and alarums needed for the historical plays that were staged there." The passage, however, only means that the Induction by Webster had been written to take the place of the elaborate musical overture which was a characteristic of the performances of the boys. The custom is described by the Duke of Stettin, who records in his Diary a visit to Blackfriars in September 1602: "For a whole hour preceding the play one listens to a delightful musical entertainment on organs, lutes, pandorins, mandolins, violins, and flutes." This elaborate overture of an hour's duration was the "not-received custom" to which Burbage refers; and it explains the phrases, "as your salad to your great feast," and "to entertain a little more time." That the *Globe* had a regular band of musicians is clear even from this play; and Mr. Cowles himself is later forced to observe: "The 'not-received custom of music' at the *Globe* seems to have been relaxed in 1604 for the production of the Marston-Webster *Malcontent* in favor of a band of wind-instruments. The play begins with this direction: 'The vilest out-of-tune music being heard, enter Bilioso and Prepasso.' " I may add that the author forgot the Blackfriars "custom of music"—the same custom seems to have prevailed at Paul's—when in Chapter IV he said: "In the age of Shakespeare, no overture was played before the curtain rose."

Chapter V, dealing with the social status of the playhouse musicians, puts its contention thus: "The men who provided this music in the theatres were a despised and outlawed caste, recruited from the ranks of strolling musicians. They were despised by the church, hated by Puritans, and mocked at even by a writer of plays like Dekker. Without visible means of support, wandering from tavern to tavern," etc. This generalization, I believe, is in the main untrue, for the reason that the author has confused the theatrical musicians with the strolling tavern fiddlers. The latter class, it is true, infested the rooms of the London taverns where they were glad to play for the conventional "fiddler's fee." But, so far as the evidence goes, the more important Elizabethan and Jacobean theatres seem to have employed the best musicians that London afforded; and these musicians were probably not less respectable than musicians of the same class to-day. In 1635 Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke wrote of the musicians belonging to the King's Men—Shakespeare's troupe—as follows: "I was so conversant with the musitians, and so willing to gain their favour, especially at this time, that I composed an aier my selfe, with the assistance of Mr.

Ives, and called it Whitelocke's Coranto; which being cried up, was first played publicly by the Blackfryars Musicke, *who were then esteemed the best of common musitians in London*. Whenever I came to that house (as I did sometimes in those days, though not often) to see a play, the musitians would presently play Whitelocke's Coranto; and it was so often called for, that they would have it played twice or thrice in an afternoon." From Sir Henry Herbert's Manuscript we learn that this band of musicians, which played at the Blackfriars and at the Globe, paid to the Master of the Revels an annual fee of £1 for license. In *The Actors' Remonstrance* (1643) we find playhouse musicians in general referred to as: "Our Musicke that was held so delectable, that they scorned to come to a Taverne under twentie shillings salary for two hours."

The chapter on "Musical Instruments and their Uses," accompanied by excellent illustrations of the more common musical instruments of the time, will prove of special value to students of Elizabethan drama. Other chapters deal with "Elizabethan Music and Its Share in the Drama," and "Some Literary Allusions to Music in Elizabethan Plays." A useful bibliography is appended. The author promises a later and fuller treatise on this subject, and states that he publishes now "in order to report progress." We hope that he will carry out his promise, and that in the meantime he will have the opportunity to fulfill a wish expressed in his Preface: "I should have liked to read and ransack every play of the period for material, but alas, I had not time enough for this."

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

*Cornell University.*

---

*UNIVERSITY DRAMA IN THE TUDOR AGE*, by Frederick S. Boas. Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1914.

Among the many books and articles of recent years helping to round out our still fragmentary knowledge of the forces that contributed to the passing of medieval morality and farce and the rise of the great romantic and poetic drama of Shakespeare and his fellows, I doubt whether any is of greater value to the student than *University Drama in the Tudor Age* by Professor F. S. Boas. The rich and varied repertory of the academic stage traced for us here in detail had become somewhat familiar through the studies of Professors Churchill and Keller in the Shakespeare *Jahrbuch*, of Professor Boas himself in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, and of Professor Moore Smith in his reprints of Latin plays. But though the present volume is in large part a repetition of facts already published, the data had been so scattered that the best informed found difficulty in following the history of university drama. Professor Boas has gathered the mass of scattered infor-